

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/822,686	04/13/2004	Hyo-suk Kim	1572.1262	2992
21171 7590 01/18/2008 STAAS & HALSEY LLP SUITE 700			EXAMINER	
			LOPEZ, FRANK D	
1201 NEW YORK AVENUE, N.W. WASHINGTON, DC 20005			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
	., _ 0 _ 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0		3745	
			·	<u></u>
•			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			01/18/2008	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

	11'				
	Application No.	Applicant(s)			
Advisory Action	10/822,686	KIM, HYO-SUK			
- Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief	Examiner	Art Unit			
	F. Daniel Lopez	3745			
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with th	e correspondence address			
THE REPLY FILED 03 January 2008 FAILS TO PLACE THIS A	APPLICATION IN CONDITION F	OR ALLOWANCE.			
 The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on this application, applicant must timely file one of the follow places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a No a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance time periods: The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date 	wing replies: (1) an amendment, stice of Appeal (with appeal fee) be with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply the of the final rejection.	affidavit, or other evidence, which in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) must be filed within one of the following			
b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this A no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire la Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (ater than SIX MONTHS from the ma	iling date of the final rejection.			
TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 70	06.07(f).				
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extunder 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b) NOTICE OF APPEAL	tension and the corresponding amous shortened statutory period for reply or r than three months after the mailing	unt of the fee. The appropriate extension fee originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as			
 The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in comp filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exter a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed AMENDMENTS 	nsion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e))	, to avoid dismissal of the appeal. Since			
3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, I (a) They raise new issues that would require further core (b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below (c) They are not deemed to place the application in bet appeal; and/or (d) They present additional claims without canceling a NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).	nsideration and/or search (see Now); tter form for appeal by materially corresponding number of finally	NOTE below); reducing or simplifying the issues for			
		Compliant Amendment (PTOL-324)			
 4. ☐ The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121. See attached Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment (PTOL-324). 5. ☐ Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): 112, 2nd paragraph; 102. 					
6. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the					
non-allowable claim(s). 7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided that the status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:	☐ will not be entered, or b) ☒ vided below or appended.	will be entered and an explanation of			
Claim(s) allowed: Claim(s) objected to: Claim(s) rejected: 4-6,8 and 10. Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE	· ·				
8. The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, bu because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).	It before or on the date of filing a d sufficient reasons why the affic	Notice of Appeal will <u>not</u> be entered davit or other evidence is necessary and			
9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to o showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary	overcome <u>all</u> rejections under ap y and was not earlier presented.	peal and/or appellant fails to provide a See 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1).			
10. The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER	n of the status of the claims afte	r entry is below or attached.			
11. The request for reconsideration has been considered bu See Continuation Sheet.	it does NOT place the applicatio	n in condition for allowance because:			
12. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s).					

/F. Daniel Lopez/ Primary Examiner Art Unit: 3745

13. Other: ____.

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Appellant describes figure A, where the coil origin is located at the center of the upper core when the piston is at the top origin. The specification states that figure 9A has 2 curves (E, F) showing the movement of the piston. The second curve F is "where the core origin does not match the coil origin" (paragraph 44) which indicates that the coil origin is at the center of the piston movement. There is no indication in the disclosure that applicant intends the coil origin to be at the center of the upper core when the piston is at the top origin. Since the explanation odes not match the disclosure, it cannot explain how the system works.

If an important aspect of this invention is that the coil origin is close to the upper core origin when the piston is at or near top dead center (as described by Appellant in the explanation); then the disclosure is insufficient in describing necessary aspects of the invention, which would result in a 112 1st paragraph rejection of the specification.